



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,483	06/19/2003	Marc Benkert	03292.200460.1	6330
66569 7590 09/04/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
GOTTSCHEK, MARTIN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3696				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,483

Applicant(s)

BENKERT ET AL.

Examiner

MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK

Art Unit

3696

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-23 and 41-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-23 and 41-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/08/2003

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. Claims 1-4, 9-23, and 41-61 have been examined. Claims 5-8 and 24-40 are cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-4, 9-23, and 41-61 in the reply filed on 06/02/2008 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 48-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 48 recites the limitation "said account domestic payment network system code". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The remaining claims depend from claim 48 and are thus rejected as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

6. 35 U.S.C. §101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 3696

7. **Claims 1-4 and 9-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
8. Based on Supreme Court precedent (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) and recent Federal Circuit decisions, §101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (the Supreme Court recognized that this test is not necessarily fixed or permanent and may evolve with technological advances. *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)).
9. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim(s), the method is not a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. §101.
10. In this particular case, regarding the first test, in performing the steps of the claimed subject matter, there is no requirement that a machine be used, thus the claims are not considered sufficiently tied to another statutory class. Regarding the second test, since the claimed subject matter may be performed using only human intelligence, the steps do not sufficiently transform the underlying subject matter to be statutory.
11. **Claims 41-61** is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to neither a process, a machine, a manufacture, nor a

Art Unit: 3696

composition of matter, but rather embraces and/or overlaps multiple statutory classes of invention which 35 U.S.C. 101 is designed to prevent. In Ex parte Lyell, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). For example, though claim 1 is a method claim, claim 41 refers to the "system claim of claim 1" then proceeds to recite system features to this and subsequent dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-4, 9-23, and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Solokl et al (US Pat# 6,173,269).

As per claim 1, Solokl teaches a method for facilitating the administration of a subsidiary account comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from a parent for a subsidiary account, said parent
identifying a parent account, said parent account being a financial account

Art Unit: 3696

associated with the parent, the parent account having a parent spending power (Solokl: col 4, Ins 12-21; Ins 35-41; col 8, Ins 55-65);

establishing a subsidiary account having a subsidiary spending capacity (Solokl; col 8, Ins 58-61);

and reducing said parent spending power by an amount less than said subsidiary spending capacity (Solokl: col 4, Ins 12-21; Ins 35-41;)

wherein said parent account is established by a first institution and said subsidiary account is at least partially maintained by a second institution (Solokl: col 5, Ins 33-46; col 10, Ins 3-6).

As per claim 2, Solokl teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said subsidiary account is fully maintained by said second institution (Solokl: col 5, Ins 33-46; col 10, Ins 3-6).

As per claim 3, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said second institution is situated in a location remote from said first institution (Solokl: col 5, Ins 33-46; col 10, Ins 3-6).

As per claim 4, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said second institution is situated in a country that is different from the country of said first

Art Unit: 3696

financial institution (Solokl: col 9, lns 54-56).

As per claim 9, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of modifying said subsidiary spending capacity in response to a request from said parent. (Solokl: col 9, lns 17-25).

As per claim 10, Solokl teaches the method of claim 9, further comprising the step of modifying said parent spending power based on a modification of the subsidiary spending capacity (Solokl: col 9, lns 16-24).

As per claim 11, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of determining a parent spending power for the parent account and a subsidiary spending capacity for the subsidiary account in accordance with a predetermined set of rules (Solokl: col 6, lns 63-66; col 9, lns 16-24).

As per claim 12, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of tracking the spending of a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 6, lns 35-49).

As per claim 13, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of limiting total spending facilitated by a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 9, lns 16-24).

As per claim 14, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the

Art Unit: 3696

step of limiting spending for a specific class of goods or services facilitated by a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 6, Ins 6-8).

As per claim 15, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of limiting spending at a specific class of merchants facilitated by a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 6, Ins 1-3).

As per claim 16, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of limiting spending at a specific merchant facilitated by a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 6, Ins 1-3).

As per claim 17, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of enforcing specific restrictions against a subsidiary account, wherein the specific restrictions exist to condition the use of the parent account (Solokl: col 8, Ins 13-15).

As per claim 18, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of accommodating an emergency transaction account (Solokl: col 9, Ins 25-30).

As per claim 19, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of generating a statement for a subsidiary account (Solokl: col 6, Ins 35-39).

Art Unit: 3696

As per claim 20, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of generating a statement for a parent account (Solokl: col 6, lns 1-3).

As per claim 21, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of terminating said subsidiary account in response to a request from said parent (Solokl: col 9, lns 19-24).

As per claim 22, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said subsidiary account is configured to carry-over spending capacity from one cycle to the next (Solokl: col 8, lns 55-65).

As per claim 23, Solokl teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said subsidiary account is configured to prevent carry-over of spending capacity from one cycle to the next (Solokl: col 8, lns 55-65).

As per claim 41, Solokl teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising:

a merchant system at least a portion of which is located domestically (Solokl: col 5, lns 18-22) said merchant system including a merchant server (Solokl: col 5, lns 47-50), said merchant server configured to receive at least one of an account number and a transaction request (Solokl: col 7 ln 60 to col 8, ln 17);

Art Unit: 3696

a customer interface configured to provide said account number to said domestic merchant server (Solokl: Fig 1, item 24; col 8, lns 6-10);

and

a foreign financial institution system configured to communicate with said merchant server (Solokl: Fig 1, item 29, col 5, lns 18-29; col 9, lns 50-56).

As per 42, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 41, wherein said merchant system further includes a merchant point of sale (POS) device configured to communicate with said customer interface and said merchant server, said POS device configured to receive said account number and provide said account number and a transaction request to said merchant server (Solokl: Fig 1, item 24, col 6, lns 16-18).

As per claim 43, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 41, wherein said subsidiary account is reloadable (Solokl: col 8, lns 55-65).

As per claim 44, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 41, wherein said subsidiary account is fully maintained by a foreign financial institution Solokl: Fig 1, item 29, col 5, lns 18-29; col 9, lns 50-56).

As per claim 45, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 42, wherein said

Art Unit: 3696

foreign financial institution system further includes a financial institution server configured to communicate with said merchant server (Solokl: Fig 1, items 25-29).

As per claim 46, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 45, wherein said foreign financial institution system further includes a financial institution database configured to communicate with said financial institution server, said financial institution database including a plurality of distinct subsidiary account storage locations wherein at least one of said plurality of distinct subsidiary account storage locations stores a unique subsidiary card number, said unique subsidiary card number corresponding to said subsidiary account number (Solokl: col 3, lns 35-39; col 4, lns 23-35; col 6, lns 40-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3696

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

16. Claims 47-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solokl as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barbara et al (US PG Pub# 2002/0016769).

As per claim 47, Solokl fails to explicitly disclose the use of routing codes, however this is taught by Barbara (Barbara: [0095]).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Barbara with the system of Solokl with the motivation to extending the use of the subsidiary account of Solokl to include receiving person-to-person payments, other than those from the parent account (Barbara: [0020]).

Note: Unless otherwise stated, the motivation to combine the Solokl and Barbara references for any subsequent claim rejections is the same as that provided above for claim 47.

As per claim 48, Barbara teaches a system according to claim 47, wherein said merchant server provides said subsidiary account number and said transaction request to said financial institution server, in accordance with at least one of said

Art Unit: 3696

account domestic payment network system code and said unique transaction routing code (Barbara: [0095]).

As per claim 49, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 48, wherein said foreign financial institution server is configured to match said account number to said corresponding one of said plurality of subsidiary card numbers, said foreign financial institution server further configured to retrieve said corresponding subsidiary card number in response to said transaction request, said subsidiary card number including subsidiary account information (Solokl: Fig 1, items 20-31).

As per claim 50, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 49, wherein said subsidiary card number is characterized by a predetermined monetary value (Solokl: col 9, lns 16-24).

As per claim 51, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 50, wherein said foreign financial institution server is configured to compare said transaction request to said predetermined monetary value, and provide to said merchant system at least one of a transaction authorized or transaction denied message, said transaction authorized message being provided where said transaction request is less than or equal to said predetermined monetary value, said transaction denied message being provided where said transaction request is more than said predetermined monetary value (Solokl: col 8, lns 13-15).

As per claim 52, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 51, wherein said financial institution is characterized by a financial institution domestic payment network system code, said financial institution domestic payment network system code corresponding to said account domestic payment network system code (Solokl: col 8: 13-15).

As per claim 53, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 52, wherein said financial institution server is configured to provide a monetary amount to said merchant server in response to said transaction request. (Solokl: col 8, lns 16-81).

As per claim 54, Barbara teaches a system according to claim 53, wherein said financial institution server is configured to provide said monetary amount in accordance with existing monetary exchange rates (Barbara: [0016]).

As per claim 55, Barbara teaches a system according to claim 54, wherein said subsidiary card number is characterized by an expiration date, and said transaction request is characterized by a transaction request date (Barbara: [0016]; [0034]-[0054]).

As per claim 56, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 55, wherein said merchant system server provides said transaction request date to said financial institution system server (Solokl: Fig 1, in particular note arrows between items

28, 20, and 30).

As per claim 57, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 56, wherein said financial institution server is configured to compare said transaction request date to said expiration date, said merchant server further configured to return a transaction denied message where said transaction date occurs later in time than said expiration date (Solokl: col 8, Ins 13-15 and 49-50).

As per claim 58, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 57, further including a sponsor configured to communicate with said financial institution system server, said sponsor configured to provide said predetermined monetary value to said financial institution for establishing said subsidiary account spending limit, said spending limit corresponding to said predetermined monetary amount, said predetermined monetary value provided in a currency capable of being processed by said financial institution system (Solokl: col 9, Ins 16-24).

As per claim 59, Solokl teaches a system according to claim 58, wherein said financial institution server is configured to reload said spending limit in response to said provided predetermined monetary value (Solokl: col 8, Ins 58-62).

As per claim 60, Barbara teaches a system according to claim 59, wherein said sponsor is configured to provide an updated expiration date to said financial institution server, said updated expiration date corresponding to at least one of

Art Unit: 3696

said subsidiary card numbers, said updated expiration date configured to replace said subsidiary card expiration date correlating to said one of said subsidiary accounts (Barbara: [0016]).

As per claim 61, Barbara teaches a system according to claim 60, wherein said financial institution server is configured to provide a portion of said predetermined monetary value to said sponsor at said expiration date, said portion of said predetermined value being provided in the currency of the country of at least one of said foreign financial institution and said sponsor (Barbara: [0076]; [0080]; [0085]; [0087]; [0095]).

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches multi-account systems including primary and subsidiary accounts; and systems for making foreign purchases with settlement, including foreign currency exchange.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK whose telephone number is (571)272-7030. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The

Art Unit: 3696

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

/Martin A. Gottschalk/
Examiner, Art Unit 3696